



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

examination, first of the *Logia*, then of Mark. The emphasis on the primary importance of *Logia*-testimony, as really autobiographical and so of the highest reliability, is an excellent feature of Dr. Gilbert's method here. Sometimes, of course, his exegetical results will not commend themselves to all scholars. The point at which exception will most certainly be taken is the view of Jesus' messiahship, which Gilbert understands in a religious sense in which eschatology is largely eliminated.

[Jesus'] ideal was widely unlike the popular dream of a messianic kingdom. The most that they had in common was that both looked toward a better state in Israel. But one was prevailingly outward, political, national; the other prevailingly inner, spiritual, and therefore essentially universal in its scope. The one was to be realized from without, the other from within. Whether Jesus, at any time, thought that this spiritual ideal would work itself out in a new and glorious Jewish state, there is no evidence to determine in an absolute manner [p. 166].

Finally, "the career of Jesus as a character of history terminated at an unknown tomb near Jerusalem" (p. 236). That tomb was probably never found empty, nor was the body of Jesus ever seen after its burial. But the testimony of all the data is conclusive for "a spiritual vision of the risen Jesus by his disciples," a vision which made them believe that which we also believe, that Jesus continued to live after his crucifixion. And "the abiding foundation of that belief is not material—an empty tomb, a reanimated physical body—but it is spiritual" (p. 307).

The book closes with a series of unusually detailed and valuable indexes. May it have a hearty welcome and a wide reading throughout the churches and the schools of theological study. We all owe Dr. Gilbert a debt of gratitude.

MEADVILLE THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL

CLAYTON RAYMOND BOWEN

IMPORTANT STUDIES IN COMPARATIVE RELIGION

The science of religion has barely won recognition as a science. The pioneers in the subject have not been many years dead. Scholars of the second generation are still with us. To them indeed has fallen much of the brunt of the work involved in winning recognition for their subject. Thus when one of them gives to the world, as M. Goblet d'Alviella has recently done,¹ the articles and reviews written by him in

¹ *Croyances, Rites, Institutions*. Par Comte Goblet d'Alviella, Paris: Paul Geuthner, 1911. 3 vols. Tome I. "Hierographie" (Archéologie et histoire religieuse). xx+386 pages; Tome II. "Hierologie" (Questions de méthode et d'origines). 412 pages; Tome III. "Hierosophie" (Problèmes du temps présent). 386 pages.

the course of thirty-five years of scholarly activity, we may look for much that has intrinsic value and for much that illustrates the progress of the science in his generation. And this is exceedingly true of the work under review.

D'Alviella's three volumes present at first sight a bewildering array of subjects which the author's triple classification under the heads of "Hierography," "Hierology," "Hierosophy" does not immediately do much to clear up. The articles, however, will be found to be of three sorts: (1) scholarly investigations by the author himself ("Moulins à prières, roues magiques et circumambulations," I, 1-25 [1897]; "Des origines de l'idolâtrie, II, 125-48 [1895]; "Chez les Mormans," I, 363-83 [1905]); (2) reviews of scholarly investigations by others (Jean Réville's *La religion à Rome sous des Sévères* under the title "La dernière floraison du paganisme antique, I, 118-37 [1886]; W. Robertson Smith, *Lectures on the Religion of the Semites*, 1st series, under the title "La théorie de sacrifice et les recherches de Robertson Smith," II, 300-316 [1897-98]); (3) articles and addresses written to further the understanding and wider acceptance of the study of the science of religion ("Des préjugés qui entravent l'étude scientifique des religions, II, 1-29 [1881]; "De la méthode comparative dans l'histoire des religions, II, 93-109 [1909]; "L'Histoire de la sciences des religions, III, 347-69 [1911]). In the first volume, "Hierography," are grouped investigations and reviews of books dealing in a descriptive manner with the practices and phases of growth of different religions ("Archéologie de la croix," I, 63-82 [1911]). In the second volume, "Hierology," are placed the articles and investigations that deal with the science of religion ("Les rites de la moisson et les commencements de l'agriculture," II, 277-98 [1898]); in the third, "Hierosophy," those that are concerned more especially with contemporary religious conditions and tendencies ("Les progrès religieuse aux États-Unis, III, 232-73 [1906]). From these citations the nature and scope of the volumes under discussion are sufficiently apparent. As for their intrinsic value, it is little affected by the fact that all the articles have, in one form or another, already seen the light. The oldest article in the collection appeared in 1875, but very few others saw the light before 1884, and the majority fall between 1890-1911. The ability and method of the author assure even to his earliest studies much of permanent value. The like may be said of the reviews which are lengthy and valuable discussions of important subjects.

But that which, for the present writer at least, outweighs in interest all other aspects of these volumes is the light they throw on the growth

of the science itself. The career of the author, his articles and reviews all tell us of the pioneers in the science, the difficulties experienced in overcoming antagonisms of all kinds, the gradual recognition of the subject by the universities, the advances made in the study of the subject.

An interesting preface shows us that the author derives inspiration primarily from Edward B. Tylor, Albert Réville, C. P. Tiele, and secondarily from Ernest Renan, Max Müller, and Herbert Spencer. To the first three, especially to Tylor, "qui, par son ouvrage classique, *Primitive Culture*, a tant contribué à lancer l'histoire comparée des religions dans sa véritable voie," (Preface, p. xii), he frequently refers as being the men whose points of view and methods have most inspired him. And this inspiration came to him, as it would appear, not so much from his special academic training which looked in the direction of law and administration, as from a natural bent for the subject. This interest showed itself first in the study of contemporary religious conditions in England. ("Une visite aux églises rationalistes de Londre," III, 1-3 [1875].) This study led both to a conscious period of preparation to give instruction in the history of religion and to the publication in 1884 of his first book, *L'Évolution religieuse contemporaine chez les Anglais, les Américains et les Hindous*. Shortly after the publication of this work, in the same year, 1884, he was admitted to teach at the University of Brussels. It is instructive to note that, at the time of his appointment, the subject of the science of religion was being taught at the universities of Holland (1876) and the Collège de France (1880). Constantly the subject, to a greater or less degree, of denunciations, D'Alviella became in 1891 as Hibbert lecturer the center of an illuminating episode. In that year the trustees of the fund had wished to have the lectures delivered at Balliol but were refused the privilege on the ground that the announced subject of D'Alviella's lectures, "Origin and Growth of the Conception of God as Illustrated by Anthropology and History," separated itself too much from purely historical ground. D'Alviella adds, as showing how much the atmosphere of Balliol has since then been liberalized, that there, in 1908, was held the "Summer School of Theology" where he was invited to give two lectures, one of which was entitled "Animism and Its Place in the Religious Evolution (II, 109-25). As a further indication of the increased recognition of the science, D'Alviella notes that, in contrast with the five universities which had by 1880 introduced the subject into the curricula, in 1911 the number of universities in which instruction in the subject was being given totaled 30.

In the articles and reviews composing the second volume the prin-

cipal advances of the science itself, since 1883, are treated in greater or less degree. Beginning with a review (1883) of A. Réville's *Les religions des peuples non civilisés*, the author initiates a series of summaries and discussions that deal with the contributions and views of (1886) Spencer's *Ecclesiastical Institutions*; (1888) Andrew Lang's *Myth, Ritual and Religion*; (1897-98) Robertson Smith's epoch-making *Lectures on the Religion of the Semites*; (1903) J. G. Frazer's *The Golden Bough*, 2d edition, signalized as "a scientific rehabilitation of magic"; with the attitude of scholars from the time of Tylor to the present toward animism (1910); and with the development of the method employed in the science.

In passing it may be interesting to observe that the fact that the contributions of the Germans to the development of this science have been relatively slight is emphasized by the relatively few references to German works to be found in the contents of these volumes. In conclusion, by way of general appraisal one may safely say that these volumes of Goblet d'Alviella constitute a valuable possession for all those to whom the conclusions of the science of religion are of importance.

CURTIS H. WALKER

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE PSYCHOLOGICAL STUDY OF RELIGION

Professor Hocking¹ has made a serious endeavor to reinterpret idealism in a way which will afford a positive groundwork for religion. The author is conscious of a deep distrust of the services of recent thought for the purposes of religion. Pragmatism has exposed the weakness of classical idealism for religious needs, but pragmatism itself is not considered constructive in this field. The adoption of a theory of the universe, after the manner of classical idealism, does not furnish sufficient objectivity and authority. Idealism fails to work, not because it employs a wrong point of view, but because it is "unfinished." It "does not give sufficient credence to the authoritative Object, shows, so far, no adequate comprehension of the attitude of *worship*." It supplies too much a religion-in-general, a religion of idea, not adequately rooted in passion, fact, and institutional life. Thus far the idealist has not been able to expound the worth and use of church, dogma, creed, priest, mediator, the whole apparatus of God-worship which religious evolution has

¹ *The Meaning of God in Human Experience: a Philosophic Study of Religion.* By William Ernest Hocking, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Philosophy in Yale University. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1912. xxii+586 pages.